IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARLIN M. ADAMS, Chapter 11 Trustee of the Post-Confirmation Bankruptcy Estates of CORAM HEALTHCARE CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation, and of CORAM INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 04-1565 (SLR)

v.

DANIEL D. CROWLEY, DONALD J. AMARAL, WILLIAM J. CASEY, L. PETER SMITH, and SANDRA L. SMOLEY,

Defendants.

APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF DANIEL CROWLEY'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

May 15, 2007

Jeffrey C. Wisler - #2795 Christina M. Thompson - #3976 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP The Nemours Building 1007 N. Orange Street Wilmington, DE 19801 (302) 658-9141

-and-

John W. Keker Elliot R. Peters R. James Slaughter KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP 710 Sansome Street San Francisco, CA 94111 (415) 391-5400

Attorneys for Defendant DANIEL D. CROWLEY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Document Description	Page
Excerpts of deposition of David M. Friedman taken on March 16, 2007	C1
Excerpts of deposition of Christina Morrison taken on March 26, 2007	C5

-	Friedma	n, David	M. 3/16/2007
	Page 1		Page 2
	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1	
İ	FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELWARE	2	
1	X	3	March 16, 2007
	ARLIN M. ADAMS, Chapter 11	4	9:31 a.m.
ĺ	Trustee of the Post-Confirmation	5	
	Bankruptcy Estates of	6	Deposition of DAVID M. FRIEDMAN,
	CORAM HEALTHCARE CORPORATION,	7	held at the offices of Kasowitz, Benson,
1	a Delaware Corporation, and of CORAM INC	8	Torres & Friedman, LLP, 1633 Broadway,
	a Delaware Corporation,	9	New York, New York, pursuant to subpoena,
ĺ	Plaintiff,	10	before Jennifer Ocampo-Guzman, a
ļ	VS. NO. 04-1565 (SLR) 11	Registered Professional Reporter,
	DANIEL D. CROWLEY, DONALD J. AMARAL,	12	Certified Real-Time Shorthand Reporter
	WILLIAM J. CASEY,	13	
	L. PETER SMITH, and		and a Notary Public of the State of New
	SANDRA L. SMOLEY, Defendants.	14	York.
1	X	15	
		16	
	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF DAVID M. FRIEDMAN	17	
	New York, New York Friday, March 16, 2007	18	
	Trucky Part Cit 201	19	
		20	
	Reported by: Jennifer Ocampo-Guzman, RPR, CRR	21	
	Semirer Seamps Guzman, Krk, Ckk	22	
		23	
		24	·
		25	
	Page 3		Page 4
1	APPEARANCES:	1	
2	•	2	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins the
3	SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP	3	videotaped deposition of David Friedman,
4	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	4	tape 1, volume I, in the matter of Adams
5	1600 Market Street, Suite 3600	5	versus Crowley in the United States
6	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103	6	District Court of the District of
7	BY: BARRY E. BRESSLER, ESQ.	7	Delaware, case number 04-1565. Today is
8	bbressler@schnader.com	8	March 16, 2007 and the time on the video
9	RICHARD A. BARKASY, ESQ.	9	monitor is 9:31 a.m.
10	220 Lake Drive East, Suite 200	10	The video operator today is Jose
11	Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002-1165	11	Rijo representing LiveNote World
12	rbarkasy@schnader.com	12	Services located at 221 Main Street,
13	KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP	13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	Attorneys for Defendant	14	Suite 1250, San Francisco, California
15	710 Sansome Street		94105, phone number (415) 321-2300.
16	San Francisco, California 94111	15	The court reporter is Jennifer
17	,	16	Ocampo of David Feldman Worldwide
		17	reporting on behalf of LiveNote World
18	rslaughter@kvn.com	18	Services.
19	KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN	19	Today's deposition is being taken
20	Attorneys for the Deponent	20	on behalf of defendant and is taking
21	1633 Broadway	21	place at 1633 Broadway, New York, New
22	New York, New York 10019	22	York.
23	BY: ROBERT M. NOVICK, ESQ.	23	Will counsel please introduce
24	rnovick@kasowitz.com	24	themselves and whom they represent.
25	ALSO PRESENT: JOSE RIJO, Videographer	25	MR. NOVICK: This is James

Page 125 Page 126 1 FRIEDMAN FRIEDMAN 2 Yes. submitted, which I think was the end of 3 Q. Would you look under, on page 25, July 2001, the fact that Mr. Crowley was at the heading number 3, "The Business earning a fee from Cerberus was no secret? Relationship Between Mr. Crowley and That's correct. Cerberus." 6 In fact it was the -- all of the Α. Yes. interested parties, whether it be Coram, note And the second paragraph there holders, equity holders were -- were well says, "Mr. Crowley and Cerberus are parties aware of that fact by the time the second to an agreement pursuant to which Mr. Crowley 10 10 disclosure statement was prepared; isn't that 11 receives a fee of \$80,000 per month with a 11 right? 12 potential for additional incentive bonuses 12 When you say all equity holders, 13 for services provided to Cerberus with 13 the ones that we were represented by Mr. Levy respect to its investments in companies other 14 14 were aware, yes, as well as other creditors. 15 than the Debtors. Mr. Crowley neither 15 Q. The equity committee? 16 receives a fee nor earns incentive bonuses 16 Α. The equity committee was certainly 17 from Cerberus for any services he provides 17 aware, yes. respecting the Debtors." Do you see that? 18 18 Q. And turning your attention to page 19 Α. Yes. 19 26, the paragraph beginning, "Although..." 20 Q. Is that accurate as far as you knew 20 "Although the CHC board of directors" -- I think "CHC" there refers to 21 the facts at the time you submitted the 21 second disclosure statement? 22 22 Coram Healthcare Corporation? 23 Α. I believe so. 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Now, at the time -- at the time 24 "Although the CHC board of 0. 25 that the second disclosure statement was directors had been aware of a business Page 127 Page 128 1 FRIEDMAN FRIEDMAN 2 relationship between Mr. Crowley and Q. More surprised than when the first 3 Cerberus, the Court found that there was plan was not confirmed? inadequate disclosure of the extent and 4 I was surprised the first time, and 5 details of the relationship, and that it even more surprised the second time. 6 could not make a finding that the Original 0. Why were you even more surprised 7 Plan was proposed in good faith in accordance that the second plan was not confirmed? 8 with section 1129(a)(3) of the Bankruptcy I thought that the path that we had 9 Code based upon the evidence in the record at embarked upon beginning in January or the time." 3.0 February of 2001, which had in essence the 10 11 Do you see that? 11 plan of retaining the Goldin firm and being 12 guided by those independent recommendations Α. 12 13 That concern of the bankruptcy 13 was one which was endorsed by the Court both court that caused it to deny the first plan 14 14 in terms of having approved the Goldin was absent with respect to the second plan; 15 15 retention, as well as -- and other actions is that right? 16 the Court had taken during the course of 17 The disclosure issue was certainly 17 2001, such as the continued approval of 18 not an issue in the second plan, I agree. 18 Coram's exclusivity with respect to filing a 19 Nevertheless, the second plan was plan, which had been opposed by the equity 19 rejected as well? 20 20 committee on at least one and perhaps 21 Α. It was not confirmed by the Court, 21 numerous occasions. 22 correct. 22 Mr. Levy had also, I believe, 23 Q. What was your reaction when the 23 during the course of 2001 sought the right to 24 plan was not confirmed by the Court? 24 bring litigation on behalf of the estate 25 I was very surprised. against Mr. Crowley, and I think that that

Pages 125 to 128

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 130

Page 129

1 FRIEDMAN 2 was opposed by Coram on the basis of Mr. Goldin's ongoing efforts, both to investigate the circumstances and to propose a recommended settlement, if you will, under the plan.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we thought -- and the Court denied his request to bring that litigation, and I think there were other steps along the way that led us to think that we were on the right path in terms of curing the defects that the Court found to have been present the first time around.

14 And so when the Court indicated 15 that it wouldn't confirm a second plan, I was 16 very surprised. I also was surprised that the Court's basis for not confirming the 17 18 second plan was the ongoing retention of 19 Crowley by Coram while he simultaneously worked for Cerberus, and that surprised me 20 21 that the Court found that to be a problem because it was I believe well-known to 22 everybody during the course of 2001, that Mr. 23 24 Crowley was continuing to work for Coram, 25

FRIEDMAN

interest of the company. And I think it was 2 no secret that he had not terminated his relationship with Cerberus, and if that were a gated of the type that the bankruptcy court considered to be one that would preclude confirmation, we thought we would have learned of it much earlier in the year, as opposed to finding it out for the first time at the confirmation decision.

Q. Let me unpack some of that answer. because there was a lot there, Mr. Friedman.

Part of your reason that you say you were surprised was because you thought essentially, in broad strokes, that the Court had endorsed the plan that you had embarked upon in terms of hiring Goldin?

- Certainly the Court endorsed the hiring of Goldin. I think the Court considered the Goldin process to be one that presented the promise of a successful reorganization.
- Q. Another point that you made was the extension of the exclusivity period?
 - Yes.

Page 131

FRIEDMAN

because operationally that was in the best

Describe for me the significance of the extension of the exclusivity period.

I think in bankruptcy cases, exclusivity is sort of the litmus test by which one gauges whether a company is on the right tract. Courts generally -- well, in case you don't -- I don't know how much you know about bankruptcy, but debtors typically automatically have exclusivity for the first 120 days of the case, and then that period can be extended for cause.

And the typical basis for cause to extend exclusivity is that the debtors are making appropriate progress towards a reorganization based upon the complexity of the case and the bona fides of the debtors' efforts and so on.

And so when exclusivity is -- when we sought to extend exclusivity in 2001 and it was opposed by Mr. Levy, and this was happening concurrently with the Goldin retention, it seemed like that would have been the appropriate time for the Court to have said either you can keep exclusivity

Page 132

FRIEDMAN

because you are doing the right thing, or I am going to lift exclusivity because you are doing the wrong thing.

Now the Court elected to continue exclusivity. In that context, I think we all took some comfort that we were on the right path.

- Q. Not only did you seek to extend exclusivity, but the equity committee sought to end exclusivity and gain permission to file its own proposed plan; is that right?
 - That's my recollection, yes.
- 0. And do you recall if they did that on more than one occasion?
- I think they did it on more than one occasion, yes.
- ٥. And what was -- do you think they did it on more than two occasions?
- My guess would that they did it --I know they did it once. My guess is \t they did it twice.
- And what was the Court's response to the equity committee's request that it be permitted to propose a plan?

Pages 129 to 132

Morrison, Christina CONFIDENTIAL

	CONFIL		
	Page 1		Page 2
	CONFIDENTIAL IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE	1 2 3	A P P E A R A N C E S: SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP Counsel for Plaintiff Arlin Adams, Trustee
	ARLIN M. ADAMS, Chapter 11 : Trustee of the : Post-Confirmation Bankruptcy : Estates of CORAM HEALTHCARE : CORPORATION, a Delaware :	4 5 6	1600 Market Street Suite 3600 Philadelphia, PA 19103 (215) 751-2336 BY: WILBUR L. KIPNES, ESQ. wkipnes@schnader.com
	Corporation and of CORAM, : INC., a Delaware Corporation, : Plaintiff : CASE NO. vs. : 04-1565	7 8 9	KEKER & VAN NEST LLP Counsel for Defendant Daniel Crowley 710 Sansome Street
	DANIEL D. CROWLEY; DONALD J. : AMARAL; WILLIAM J. CASEY; : L. PETER SMITH; AND SANDRA L. : SMOLEY, : Defendants :	10 11 12	San Francisco, CA 94111-1704 (415) 391-5400 BY: WARREN A. BRAUNIG, ESQ. wbraunig@kvn.com
	 Monday, March 26, 2007	13 14	AND: ELLIOT R. PETERS, ESQ. epeters@kvn.com DEUTSCHE BANK
	9:46 a.m. Videotaped deposition of	16	Counsel for Witness Christina Morrison Deutsche Bank AG New York Legal Department 60 Wall Street
	CHRISTINA MORRISON, held at the law offices of Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP, 1735 Market Street, 51st Floor, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19103,	17 18 19	New York, NY 10005-2858 (212) 250-7332 BY: CHARLIE GAMBINO, ESQ. charlie.gambino@db.com
	pursuant to notice before Cynthia A. Whyte, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public.	20 21 22	ALSO PRESENT: VINCENZO PETULLA, Videographer
		23 24 25	v rueographei
	Page 3		Page 4
2	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among counsel for the	1 2 3	INDEX WITNESS: PAGE CHRISTINA MORRISON
3	respective parties hereto that the filing, sealing and certification of the	4 5 6	By Mr. Braunig 7, 181 By Mr. Kipnes 136 MORRISON EXHIBITS
5 6 7	within deposition shall be and the same are hereby waived. IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED	7 8 9	NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE Exhibit 1 Memo, 6/5/01, to List from Ms. Gould 25
8 9	AND AGREED that all objections, except as to the form of the	10 11	Exhibit 2 Letter, 1/16/99, to Mr. Smith from Ms. Morrison 29
10 11 12	question, shall be reserved to the time of the trial. IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND	12 13	Exhibit 3 Excerpt of Transcript, 10/26/01 39 Exhibit 4 Letter, 7/12/99, to Mr. Kahn from Mr.
13 14 15	AGREED that the within deposition may be signed before any Notary Public with the same force and effect as if signed and	14 15 16	Crowley 43 Exhibit 5 Memo, 9/20/99, to Mr. Meffe and Ms. Kopta from Ms. Morrison and Mr.
16 17	sworn to before the Court.	17 18	Guthner 54 Exhibit 6 Offering Memorandum 62
18 19 20		19 20	Exhibit 7 "Project Caddy, Confidentiality Agreements Proposal Packets Distributed
21 22		21 22	December 1999" 71 Exhibit 8 Second round bid letters 74
23 [°]		23 24	Exhibit 9 "Buyer Due Diligence Questions 1-31-00.doc 82
25		25	Exhibit 10 Minutes, 2/10/00 84

Morrison, Christina CONFIDENTIAL

<u></u>			
	Page 125		Page 126
1	This was the process we were hired to	1	of the question.
2	undertake and that was the process we	2	A. Did I have any? No.
3	undertook.	3	MR. BRAUNIG: Why don't we take
4	Q. But you did your very best to help	4	a break for lunch right now and we can
5	them get the best deal they could get,	5	reconvene. It is 12:46 right now.
6	correct?	6	VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are now
7	A. We yeah; we went through every	7	off the record at 12:44.
8	part of the process, as we were requested to	8	(Luncheon recess.)
9	do so, and rendered a fairness opinion.	9	VIDEO TECHNICIAN: We are now
10	Q. And your opinion, the opinion of	10	on the record at 1:22.
11	Deutsche Bank, when the entire process was	11	BY MR. BRAUNIG:
12	reviewed and you went through the financial	12	Q. Let's return to the June 9
13	terms and you went through the procedural	13	presentation in the fairness opinion that
14	elements associated with this transaction, did	14	Deutsche Bank created.
15	you have any did you have any doubt that	15	You said that you presented this to
16	this transaction was fair?	16	Coram's board of directors?
17	MR. KIPNES: Object to the form	17	A. Yes.
18	of the question.	18	Q. And this was over the phone?
19	A. We rendered a fairness opinion, so	19	A. Correct.
20	felt between the fairness and committee and	20	Q. Do you recall who was on the phone
21	the review with the board that this was a fair	21	at the time?
22	transaction.	22	A. I don't.
23	Q. Did you have any doubt that this	23	MR. BRAUNIG: Why don't we go
24	transaction was fair?	24	ahead and mark Exhibit 19, Morrison 19.
25	MR. KIPNES: Object to the form	25	(Morrison Exhibit 19 was marked
	Page 127		Page 128
1	for identification.)	1	A. I do not recall.
2	Q. There is a why don't you read the	2	Q. Were you on the call when the board
3	first paragraph, please. This is Morrison 19.	3	of directors decided whether or not to approve
4	Does this refresh your recollection	4	the transaction?
5	as to this is the minutes of a telephonic	5	A. I don't recall if I was or not.
6	meeting of the board of directors of Coram	6	Q. Do you know whether the board
7	Healthcare Corporation dated June 9, 2000.	7	ultimately approved the transaction?
8	Does this refresh your recollection	8	A. Yes, they did.
9	as to who the participants were on this call?	9	Q. Do you know whether that approval
10	A. I don't recall that I was introduced	10	was unanimous?
11	to everybody that was on the call, so all I	11	A. I don't know.

Did you do any additional work for Coram after June 9, 2000?

A. Dan called and asked if I would be interested in talking to them about some potential financing alternatives, which I did in sort of the context of a pitch to see if there was anything additional that could -any additional work that could be done. So it wasn't -- I wasn't hired to do anything. It was really in the context of a pitch, an investigation.

Q. Did Dan tell you why he was interested in this pitch, in this sort of early stage investigation?

the transaction.

fairness opinion?

the transaction?

Α.

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

know is from what is on this document.

presentation that you made?

was the discussion that was had about the

documents and stated that Deutsche Bank was

prepared to render a fairness opinion as to

Do you recall if there was

discussion among the board of directors about

And did you -- what did you -- what

I went through the fairness opinion

Did they ask questions about the

I don't recall anything specific.

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3/26/2007

Morrison, Christina CONFIDENTIAL

Page 185 Page 186 I have read the foregoing CERTIFICATE transcript of my deposition given on I HEREBY CERTIFY that the Monday, March 26, 2007, and it is true, proceedings, evidence and objections are correct and complete to the best of my contained fully and accurately in the knowledge, recollection and belief except stenographic notes taken by me on Monday, for the corrections noted hereon and/or March 26, 2007, and that this is a true and the list of corrections, if any, attached correct transcript of same. on a separate sheet herewith. 8 10 1.0 11 11 12 13 CHRISTINA MORRISON 13 14 Cynthia A. Whyte, RPR 15 15 16 16 Subscribed and sworn before 17 17 (The foregoing certification of 18 me this _____day of_____, 2007 18 this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means, 19 19 20 20 unless under the direct control and/or 21 supervision of the certifying reporter.) 22 22 23 23 24 24 25 25

SLIP SHEET